

# Dan Brown's Coin Shop, Inc.

## Professional Numismatists

PHONE 303 244-7222  
1532 BROADWAY  
DENVER, COLORADO 80202

April 12, 1986

Mr. Lyle Hamm  
P.O. Box 14030  
St. Louis, Mo.

Dear John:

It was nice talking with you last week. Sorry I was so much in the dark on many of the various things that you mentioned. Here in Denver we get isolated, and as I don't attend too many conventions I don't keep up with everything. But you're right, like Lou Young and some of the others have to do.

As I get more and more letters back and forth, I am thinking out more about what has happened, and it looks like except what I said might not be such an expect after all. Lou Young is after him now in regards to a certain coin that John sold his through Paul Franklin, and I think there are many others. I have also seen reference in the Colorado press which you mentioned. I'm glad that all this has had to happen; I hope that everything comes out for the best without too many problems. But, it looks like Paul Franklin may have done some fancy work, or had it done. Again, that's just a supposition of my own.

I believe you received a letter from Paul Carlson dated April 3rd. I can't know just what is wrong with Mr. Carlson; that he expects few people. After all, both the NGF and the ANA donated quite a sum of money to help clear this matter up. It was referred to the Committee, the Committee gave their report. He has to be part of the Committee through the NGF. Besides Carlson had maintained a near as far professional; Francis Car- of course names belonging, and look proper didn't. There was still there NGF members.



If anybody has jurisdiction over them, then it would be the AIA. And you could the AIA estimate the refund. Tommy Ryan, who sold the piece to Garland has been out of the AIA for about ten years. Therefore, all that I can see is that Garland should resort to the court of law. He has been most unreasonable as far as I am concerned. He mentions that Lee Young guaranteed him the return of his money. But, I notice that ~~he~~ <sup>Lee</sup> also put in that "If you want it in me now, otherwise if you prefer your fight for a refund can be decided by the Arbitration Fund." That tells the AIA and Lee Young all right there. But, there is no way in the world that AIA would guarantee anything of this nature, whether the President said so or not as an individual. It does not involve the AIA. I think our judge is over his head, due to the fact that we were willing to donate money and help in every way we could to determine whether the coin was a genuine coin or not. But, it was not in our hands to go in and tell the Fund what they had to decide. Again, that is more the AIA responsibility than ours. We only did what we could do.

If I get to the bank today I'll send on to you for the fun of letting you see it -- my friend which I mentioned to you on the phone. I think I wrote a note regarding it, which is in the box the input is in. I originally thought it approximately due to twelve months and sold it to Herman Rubin. Then he disposed of his pioneer collection, I bought it back from him and have had it ever since. I did offer it in 1962 at \$10,000, but since then I haven't had it for sale. I just enjoy having the piece. Now you get a chance, it will be nice to have your comments on it.

With every best wish.

No copies of this  
to any one

Cordially yours,  
Dan

DD/4

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

April 22, 1968

Mr. Dan Brown  
1532 Broadway  
Denver, Colorado 80200

Dear Dan:

Your friendly letter of April 12, 1968, was a pleasure to receive. It is so different from the letters recently written on the Pioneer Gold matter. It is most distressing to see these things happen but when people feel abused the fur often flies.

You naturally want to do what is right for P.N.E.S. That may mean doing things contrary to what a few of its members want. You apparently had a meeting in Chicago to discuss the problem and now see how difficult it is to control.

You mention the cost of the Garland-Ryan matter to P.N.E.S. This was a trifle compared to the cost of time and money to the arbitrators, and to some others including us. What the arbitrators desperately needed and didn't have was a lawyer or someone to guide them impartially. The arbitrators never realized in advance the problems they walked into. This was supposed to be a trial, not an investigation. The full evidence was not available to either party to the trial, nor the right to cross-examine. We do not know if Ryan or the arbitrators called certain witnesses or whether witnesses volunteered. The fact that the decision was not published was a tragedy and we can understand how an assumption could be made that for some reason the press was muzzled in some manner not of their choosing. We hear the decision of the arbitrators was revised after it was announced. Things like that can't be swept under the rug. The press reports other litigation when filed and when decided and this was no different.

Mr. Dan Brown  
April 22, 1968  
Page Two

Garland won the case. There has been no appeal. You feel Garland should resort to a court of law to enforce the arbitration decision. The A.N.A. has no control over the case or the arbitrators as such, but does have control over the conduct of its members. The charges which are filed will start more turmoil, but are no doubt aimed at collecting the judgment among other things.

There seems to be a feeling that the value of coins in general will fall if the public becomes fearful of forgeries. We believe that decisions and facts must be open. Rumors, right or wrong, shake confidence even more. We believe that some of your members have and had pertinent knowledge on certain facts relating to the arbitration and were not called upon to give it. They did not volunteer it as far as we know. We feel that it would have been wiser if they had volunteered it to the arbitrators or the parties.

If you know any way for us to be helpful we are ready to try to do so. You really have your hands full with a situation not of your own making - a Viet Nam junior.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman  
ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC  
EDUCATION SOCIETY

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

May 16, 1968

Mr. Dan Brown  
1532 Broadway  
Denver, Colorado 80202

Dear Dan:

It is very satisfying to exchange views with you even though we may see things a different way. There are certain items in your letter which I believe you should consider further.

You felt that the case should not have had all the publicity it had. Actually it didn't have any of which I am aware other than gossip. No coin publication ever mentioned it and, finally, Coin World has gathered enough fortitude to want to put out a story three months after the decision. This may just be the beginning of published stories, assuming it is published. Then the other publications will probably find the topic newsworthy.

In your paragraph on the auto companies, I assume you use the word "Ford" as a car rather than a man! However, the reference to autos or shoes is not applicable. Nothing has been recalled. There are many 20 USAOG pieces from the Franklin source and lots of other types from the same source. Many are in the hands of collectors. The Red Book says some of these items are under study. We wonder whether anyone is doing anything about the situation. Why don't you ask members of the PNG whether any have seen Franklin or know of his whereabouts since the beginning of 1967. Why don't you ask PNG members what transactions or negotiations they have had with Franklin relative to Pioneer Gold or with anyone handling Franklin source pieces. Such information, if obtained, might be most helpful to clear up doubts which will otherwise remain in the minds of many. These facts would have been more helpful at the hearing than the cash contribution of the PNG. It doesn't have to embroil them --- only the facts are wanted --- not opinions.

We, like you, will be glad to see the end of this mess, but the end must be based upon conclusions drawn from facts.

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

Page 2

May 16, 1968

Mr. Len Brown  
1532 Broadway  
Denver, Colorado 80202

Have you seen the arbitration file? Why don't you try to see it if you haven't. Has Max Schwartz seen it? May we see it? Now you have something to answer.

Thanks for being so frank.

Cordially,

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC  
EDUCATION SOCIETY

EPV  
atb

# Dan Brown's Coin Shop, Inc.

## Professional Numismatists

PHONE 303 244-7222  
1532 BROADWAY  
DENVER, COLORADO 80202

June 17, 1978

Mr. John L. Hammer  
1700 Euclid Ave.  
St. Louis 5, Mo.

Dear John:

Really don't have a chance even yet to answer your nice letter of the 21st, but I'll write to try.

As President of the ANS and as the president before me, also our officers and members, our goal has been to better the relationship between collectors and dealers as much as we possibly could. Of course, we are only human and we can only represent our members so far, as well as ourselves. On the over-all picture I think we as a group, ANS, has been outstanding and believe it or not, everything that applies does not rest in.

Coming to the Galiano numismatist, we mention the deal as a fair deal imposed in the heat of time and money to the arbitrators, and others including ourselves. That has been. But, it was still hard and fair was members' pockets, which we must like to donate to try to close the matter up. It's a shame that this ever has to happen in the first place; only wish it could not be closed up successfully soon. Good time of the flowers that handles the coin, with the exception of Wilson, who made the big profit and willing to give a refund <sup>all the way</sup> to John Fann. But, he will not concede. John Fann and his group still feel that the coins are genuine, and he has not a pretty good money of losses in his side.

I note that you mention about the money being muffled. I don't think that is so at all. In fact, there will be a money release in it soon. But I cannot possibly see why this case should have had all the publicity that it has. Wilson has made solving the problem; and some still saying the coins are genuine and the others saying they are not. The arbitrators on the panel wisely ruled in the fact that the coin was not a 1900 as represented to Fann and his group. Therefore, if you will not give him his money back, the cause of law is his next step. If that is necessary then him can be





helped out of the American National Association, which will happen if he once more refuses. It would never be used to score ten cents; he can go right back to the next folder from when he got it unless it is to be broken.

In your need to the last paragraph you mention that some of my readers are not interested in the matter. I should know of them and like myself; do not wish to ask admirers in matters that do not concern them when there are others so much interested. I, personally, am not a doubter but I am sure that I am sure that they would. Let me say on my part of the business, that if anything is not right to a customer, there is no problem of a refund. I am sure that even if nothing is, it will go out of the marketing process in the market, take the same stand.

As for publicity: needs that need would it not? and Justice has been vocal enough. It would have been harder if it had been done in such a way, and he might have received better and easier results. But, he evidently wanted the publicity and therefore he has not a problem on his hands of his own choosing. Again, I am not upholding him; if the case is not genuine he would not be going back immediately, as he is allowed to do -- with the exhibition period now there is nothing for him, and should be used immediately. Otherwise, as mentioned, the court of law.

Looking to the publicity angle: I'm sure that Paul, General Schmitt, Christian - what else have to be called need that one not concern, it needs them in a certain respect. I'm sure that if General Schmitt happens to get out a bunch of non-perfect along this matter's end it is publicity. Therefore, I can see no reason for this matter to be public in the way it has been, and finally, I'll be very glad to see the use of it. As you know, I had to work hard; Len Stone is out of the country at the present time; and Schmitt is handling most of it and he has a job that makes it clear on it. So, that's how that it runs before me, and that something like this never makes again.

I have nothing to write to be. Please don't take offense at what I have said on my own -- just my share is reasonable, and nothing official. The official part I am leaving to my class of and that the Schmitt in everything connected with this as is to keep me from getting involved.

Very cordially yours,

Dan

John F. Kennedy  
no reply